E 666
.G22

# NATIONAL POLITICS.

## Able Review of the Situation.

### SPEECH BY

# HON. J. A. GARFIELD,

### Delivered at Warren, O., Sept. 1, 1866.

GEN. GARFIELD opened the campaign in his District, at Warren, Ohio, on Saturday, when he delivered the following speech :

FELLOW-CITIZENS :—The great conflict of arms through which the nation has passed, the many and peculiar consequences resulting therefrom, and especially the new duties devolving upon the people, must, for the present and for many years to come, be the chief topic of political discussion. The stupendous facts of the Rebellion overshadow and involve all other political considerations, and the new problems arising out of the contest are beset with difficulties of unusual magnitude. The work of overcoming these difficulties and solving these problems has been committed by the good people of the United States to their representatives in the executive, legislative and judicial departments of the Federal Government, and some progress has been made during the past year. I shall undertake to prove to you, my fellow-citizens, what progress the servants of the people have made in the discharge of these high duties. I shall speak of the progress made during the past year in

I. Our financial affairs ;

II. Our military affairs ;

III. The restoration of the States lately in rebellion.

The pecuniary cost of the war was enormous, and without a parallel in history. It is impossible even to comprehend the sum expended. It can only be understood when compared with other expenditures. In the statements I shall make concerning the cost of the war, let it be remembered that I do not include the loss occasioned by the withdrawal of more than two millions of laborers from industrial pursuits, nor the vast sums expended by States, counties, cities and individuals, in payment of bounties, and for the relief of sick and wounded soldiers and their families, nor the larger losses, that can never be estimated, of property destroyed by hostile armies. The cost of which I shall speak is that which appears on the books of the Federal Treasury. For three-quarters of a century the debt of Great Britain has been considered the financial wonder of the world. That debt, which had its origin in the revolution of 1688, was swelled by more than one hundred years of wars, and other political disasters, till in 1793, it had reached the sum of one thousand, two hundred and sixty-eight millions of dollars. From that time till 1815, a period of twenty-two years of terrible war, England was engaged in a life and death struggle with Napoleon—the greatest war of history, save our own—and at its close in 1815, she had added three thousand and fifty-six millions dollars to that debt, a sum which all the world thought must bring her to financial ruin. From the 30th day of June, 1860, to the 30th day of June, 1865, the expenditures of the Government of the United States were more than three thousand, five hundred millions. That is, in five years, we increased our debt five hundred millions more than England had hors in twenty-two years of her greatest war, almost as much as she did in one hundred and twenty-five years of war.

But let us compare ourselves with ourselves. Our official records show that the total cost of our war of Independence was one hundred and thirty-five millions, and the total expenditures of the Federal Government, from the meeting of the first Government on the 4th of March, 1789, to June 30th, 1860, was 2,015 millions of dollars, making the total expenditures from the beginning of the revolution in 1775 to the beginning of the rebellion, 2,350 millions of dollars. That is, the expenses of the last five years have been 1,250 millions more than all other expenses since the Government was founded.

According to the census of 1860, the total value of all the real and personal property of the United States was sixteen billions of dollars. The cost of the war was more than three and a half billions—that is, every 1,600 worth of property in the United States was mortgaged for the payment of 350 dollars of the public debt. This debt is the money price which the nation pledged to save its existence, and we are bound by every sense of gratitude, honor and patriotism, to redeem that pledge, principal and interest, to the uttermost farthing. The loyal people have accepted the responsibility, and have cheerfully consented to bear the burden of such taxes as would hardly be endured by any other people. Indeed, a leading English journal has recently declared that if Parliament should impose a tax upon the English people as heavy as the one now paid by the people of the United States, it would cause a rebellion in that kingdom.

More than eight hundred millions of dollars of our expenses were paid by taxation while the war was in progress, and during the last fiscal year, besides paying our heavy annual expenses, we have reduced the debt one hundred and twenty-four millions of dollars, so that on the first day of August, 1866, our debt stood at two thousand, six hundred and thirty-three millions of dollars. Should we be able to reduce it at the same rate hereafter, the last dollar of it would be paid in twenty-one years. Nearly all of this debt is held by citizens of the United States who loaned their money to the Government at a time when traitors were hoping and faint-hearted friends were fearing that our cause would be lost. It was a sublime and inspiring spectacle to see the loyal millions, from the wealthy capitalist to the day laborer, offering their substance as a loan to the Government, when their only hope of return rested in their faith in the justice of the cause and the success of our arms. There were single days in which twenty-five millions of dollars were thus offered. Less than half the debt is now in long bonds, which have from fifteen to thirty-five years to run, but one thousand, six hundred millions will fall due within two years and a half. As they cannot be paid by taxation in

so short a time, Congress, at its last session, passed a loan bill, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to buy up these short bonds, and put on the market in their stead long bonds, and if practicable, at a lower rate of interest. The bill, however, did not authorize any increase of the debt, but only an exchange of long bonds for short ones, which is now being effected. Intimately connected with our public debt is the question of

OUR NATIONAL CURRENCY.

At the breaking out of the war the currency of the country consisted of gold and silver and the circulating notes of sixteen hundred banks, organized under the laws of the different States. The notes of these banks not being based upon any uniform security, were of different relative value, and were always of less value as they were further from home.—Our paper money system had become a grievous evil, for which there seemed to be no remedy. But the necessities of the war compelled the Government to issue circulating notes, and the opportunity was fortunately seized by our distinguished Secretary, Salmon P. Chase, to sweep away the vicious system of State banks, which had grown up in defiance of the plain declaration of the Constitution, that "no State shall emit bills of credit or make anything but gold and silver a legal tender," and to substitute in its place our present circulation of greenback and National bank notes. Where a citizen holds a dollar of this paper in his hand, he knows that there is one dollar and ten cents in Government bonds locked up in the vaults of the Treasury at Washington, and pledged for the redemption of that dollar, in case the National Bank should fail. This dollar is the same in Minnesota as Maine. It is national, and not local.

But another and still more important advantage has been gained by the change in our system of currency. Under the old system, the General Government had no control over the amount of currency which might be put into circulation. Each bank issued notes in accordance with the laws of the State in which it was organized. Now it is a well settled principle in economy, that no more money is needed in any country than just the amount necessary to effect the payments to be made in that country. If there be less than that amount, the money market is stringent, and exchanges are difficult. If there be more, the surplus will cause a rise in prices, or, what is the same thing, a depreciation of the value of each dollar. By putting the control of the currency into the hands of the Federal Government, Congress was enabled to regulate the amount of circulation in accordance with the necessities of the business. The vast expenditures of the war required a large increase of the volume of the currency. Before the war, about 300 millions of money were needed for the business of the country. Much of the time during the war, we have had more than 1,000 millions. Now, that we are returning to the pursuits of peace, it becomes necessary to reduce the amount of our paper money, and thus bring prices down to the old standard. To determine whether there is too much currency is always difficult, but the best criterion is the price of gold. We may be certain that in times of peace, when there are great disturbing political causes at work, if a paper dollar is worth much less than a gold dollar, there are many more paper dollars than the business of the country demands. Therefore, in the Loan Bill, Congress provides for a gradual contraction of the currency. Under the operation of that law, and with a judicious management of our revenues, we may expect a gradual decline in gold, and a corresponding fall in prices, until we shall reach the solid basis of gold and silver. An uncertain and changeable standard of value is a great financial evil. If the dollar of to-day shall be worth a dollar and a half in six months from now, the debtor must pay fifty per cent more than he promised. If in six months the dollar should be worth that much less, the creditor would suffer a similar loss.

Let me remark that if the Democratic party, which holds to the extreme doctrine of State rights should come into power, they would, without doubt sweep away our national currency system, and return to the wretched system of State banks and State currency. The maintenance of our national credit, and the ultimate redemption of our national debt must depend mainly on a wise, just but severe system of

FEDERAL TAXATION.

Until the beginning of the late war but one of the great nations of the earth was so lightly taxed as our own. We had not studied the science of taxation, because happily we had no need to do so. But the war brought the heaviest burdens on our people, and when the 39th Congress assembled, we found that many of our taxes were laid upon those branches of industry which were least able to bear them. Nearly all our revenues are derived from two sources, viz, the customs or tariff duties, and internal taxes. Congress made a thorough revision of the internal revenue system, and it is believed that many important improvements have been made. The provisions of the late revenue law of July 13, 1866, are based upon the following general principles:

1. To abolish or greatly reduce all taxes which tend to discourage the development of wealth, and so to adjust the law that the burden should chiefly fall on realized wealth.

2. That taxes should not be duplicated by taxing the different processes through which an article passes in being manufactured, but the tax should be laid upon the furnished article when ready for sale.

3. That articles of prime necessity, like provisions, clothing, agricultural implements, should be nearly or quite exempt from taxation, but the public burdens should fall upon articles which minister to vice and luxury.

Guided by these general principles, and finding that the ample revenues of the Government would enable us to reduce the amount of taxation seventy-five millions, Congress proceeded to exempt entirely from taxation the following articles. Building materials, such as building stone, slate, marble, brick, tiles, window glass, paint, painter's colors, linseed oil and other vegetable oils, lime and Roman cement, and also exempt from taxation repairs of all kinds. Also agricultural implements and products, such as machinery for the manufacture of sugar, syrup and molasses, from sorghum, imphee, beets and corn; plows, cultivators, harrows, planters, seed drills, hand rakes, grain cradles, reapers, mowers, threshing machines, winnowing mills, corn shellers and cotton gins; such articles of prime necessity as gypsum and fertilizers of all kinds; maple, beet, sorghum and beet sugar, and molasses; vinegar, saleratus, starch and soap valued at less than three cents per pound; American steel and railroad iron; and finally, all tombstones valued at less than $100, and all monuments, whether erected by public or private munificence, to commemorate the service of Union soldiers who had fallen in battle or died in the service. They reduced the tax on cloth-

6713A4

ing and boots and shoes from six per cent. to two per cent.; exempted milliners and dress makers from tax, and exempted shoemakers and tailors whose work, exclusive of materials, does not exceed $100 per annum. The tax on slaughtered animals being a war tax, was repealed. Except cotton and tobacco, no agricultural product is now taxed at all.

No license or special tax is now required of farmers, while all other pursuits and professions are required to pay such a tax from ten to one thousand dollars, and more in proportion to the amount of business.

As an illustration of the vicious system of duplication of taxes, it was found that by the time an American book had been sold in the market that there had been paid from twelve to fifteen seperate taxes upon it. Each constituent part of the book—paper, cloth, leather, boards, thread, glue, gold leaf and type material—had paid a tax of from three to five per cent., and the finished article, when sold, had paid a tax of five per cent. upon the selling price. The law was, therefore, so amended as to remove the tax from the separate parts and processes, and levy it on the finished product. On this principle the tax was repealed on mineral coal, pig iron and castings for parts of machinery, and placed upon the machine when finished. Also the tax was removed from crude petroleum and placed upon the refined article when ready for use.—The tax on stoves and hollow ware articles, for domestic use was reduced from six to three dollars per ton. That our educational forces might not be weakened, the tax on books, magazines, newspapers, printing paper and all printing material was greatly reduced.—The heaviest taxes are now levied on distilled spirits, ale, beer, tobacco, cigars, refined petroleum, cotton and gas, carriages of high value, gold and silver plate; but silver table ware used by any one family, not exceeding forty ounces, is exempt from any tax.

Fifty per cent. of all our internal taxes are raised on manufactures. Stamp taxes, another very productive source of revenue, are nearly all paid by the business men of the country.

TARIFF.

One second source of revenue is the tariff duties on imported goods, from which we realize about one-third of all our revenues.

A carefully revised tariff bill passed the House, but was postponed in the Senate till next session. It provided for increased protection on American wool, linseed, tobacco, and cigars, iron and steel, and the various articles manufactured from them. A bill was however passed, which will indirectly effect a considerable increase of tariff duties. As the law before stood, the advalorem duties on imports were levied on the price at which the articles were purchased in the foreign country, exclusive of cost of transportation to the seaboard and the various port charges. Under the law importers bought their goods far in the interior and consequently paid the duty on a price much lower than the article could be bought for at the point of export. By the new law the duty is to be levied on the articles after there have been added to the original purchase price all the transportation, storage, wavage, wharfage and port charges. This will both increase the duties and protect the Government against fraud.

On the general question of protection there are great extremes of opinion among the people of the United States and their extremes appear in full strength among their Representatives in Congress.

One class would have us place so high a duty upon foreign merchandize as to prohibit the importation of any article which this country produces or can produce. Besides placing ourselves in an attitude of perpetual hostility to other nations, and greatly reducing our carrying trade, this policy would tend to make monopolists of all the leading manufacturers of this country, who could fix the price of all their products at their discretion. If, on the other hand, we should adopt the theories of the radical free trader, and declare that our tariff shall be only for revenue, and nothing for protection, and particularly were that doctrine to be put in practice at such a time as in 1836, when we had no debt, and a large surplus in the Treasury to be given away, no one can fail to see that we should break down the dike which our predecessors have erected for the defense of American industry, which produces nearly one-half of the annual income of the people (for the manufactured products of this country in 1860 were valued at $1,000,000,000.)

We should revolutionize our industrial system and place us at the mercy of foreign manufacturers. Let either of these parties frame the tariff and the result will be calamitous in the highest degree. One of the worst features of our industrial system is the irregularity and the uncertainty of the legislation in reference to the tariff. It subjects the business of manufacturers to the uncertainty of a lottery investment. If the prohibitionists succeed one year, the profits of the manufacturers are enormous. If as is quite probable, the reaction of next year puts free traders in power, the losses are equally great. What, then, is the point of equilibrium where we can balance these great industries with the most reasonable hope of permanence? We have seen that one extreme school of economists would place the price of all manufactured articles in the hands of foreign producers, but rendering it impossible for our manufacturers to compete with them while the other extreme school, by making it impossible for the foreigners to sell their competing wares in our market would have no check upon the prices which our manufacturers might fix upon their product. I hold, therefore, that a properly adjusted competition between home and foreign products is the best gauge by which to regulate international trade. Duties should be so high that our manufacturers can fairly compete with the foreign product, but not so high to enable them to drive out the foreign articles, enjoy a monopoly and regulate the price as they please. To this extent I am a protectionist. If our Government pursues this line of policy, steadily, we shall, year by year, approach more nearly the basis of free trade, because we shall be more nearly able to compete with other nations on equal terms. I am for a protection which leads to an ultimate free trade. I am for that free trade which can only be achieved through protection.

OUR MILITARY AFFAIRS.

When the rebellion collapsed in 1865, we had on the rolls of the War Department, and in the pay of the Government, over one million of soldiers. A few weeks later a larger army than was ever actually engaged in one battle, and with a rare perfection of discipline and military outfit, marched in review before the President and his Cabinet, were mustered out of service, and quietly resumed the pursuits of peace, and mingled again with the mass of citizens. There had been in the field more than two millions of Union soldiers, of whom 250,000 perished by battle and disease, and nearly as many more came home nearly or in part disabled by the accidents of war. In January last the army had been reduced to 123,000 and Congress has now fixed an army for the future at about 55,000 men. In reorganizing the army and adding new regiments Congress has provided that all company officers to fill these new or original vacancies, created by the increase of the army, and two-thirds of the field officers, shall be given to the volunteers—these volunteers to be selected from officers or enlisted men, no distinction being made between them. But applicants must produce evidence of good character and capacity, stand an examination before a board, and show in addition to their testimonials, that they have faithfully and efficiently served either as officers or men at some time during the war against the rebellion. It has also provided that four regiments of infantry and two regiments of cavalry shall be colored men, and officers shall be selected from those officers who commanded colored troops during the war. It is also provided that four regiments shall be made up of officers and enlisted men who received injuries while in the service of their country, but are still able to perform garrison duty and other light service. The pension list has been largely increased, and the pensions of soldiers and

sailors who had lost both arms or both legs has been doubled. No patriot will object to the increased burden imposed upon them in discharging their sacred duty to those heroic sufferers. The legislation in reference to equalizing bounties was not so satisfactory. It was very desirable to pass some law by which the bounties of Government to volunteers should be made to approach some measure of equality. A considerable portion of the army received no bounty, while others received large local, State and national bounties. It was a difficult question to settle on any just basis without involving the Government in a dangerous increase of the public debt. After mature deliberation the Military Committee of the House brought in a bill which provides that every soldier who had received no bounty should be paid eight and one-third dollars for every month of honorable service, which would be one hundred dollars for each full year. If he had received some bounty, but less than that amount, the Government should pay him enough to make it up to that rate—so that every soldier in the Union army should receive a bounty of at least one hundred dollars for each year of honorable service. This bill passed the house by the unanimous vote of the Union members, but the Senate took no action upon it. Near the close of the session the Senate added to an appropriation a section increasing the pay of Members of Congress. The House refused to concur, but added in place of that section the House bounty bill. The Senate refused to concur, and after several conferences between the two Houses, a section was agreed upon which gives a bounty of one hundred dollars to every soldier who served three years, and who has not already received more than one hundred dollars bounty, and an additional bounty to all soldiers who enlisted and served for the term of two years, and who has not already received a bounty of one hundred dollars. The operation of this section is confined exclusively to these two classes, and gives no more for three years' service than four, and gives nothing to those who enlisted for a less term than two years. It is much less just than the House bill, and being coupled with a section which increased the pay of members of Congress, I voted against both. They passed the House, however, by a majority of one, and became a law. It is hoped and believed that the original House bill or some equivalent measure will become a law at next session.

But, though the questions of financial and military legislation are worthy of the earnest attention of every citizen, I fear I have already dwelt too long upon them. I therefore invite your attention to what so nearly concerns our future peace, and upon which the great issues are now made up, and must be settled by the ballots of the people at the coming election, viz:

The restoration of the late rebel States. For a clear understanding of the issues let us consider the character of the contest through which we have passed. The rebellion had its origin in two causes: first, the political theory of State sovereignty, and second, the historical accident of American slavery.

The doctrine of State sovereignty or State rights, as it has been more mildly designated, was first publicly announced in the Virginia resolutions of 1798, but more fully elaborated and enforced by Calhoun in 1830, since which time it has been acknowledged as a fundamental principle in the creed of the Democratic party, and has been affirmed and re-affirmed in nearly all the State and national platforms for the last thirty years. That doctrine as stated by the ablest leaders the Democracy ever had, is this: "The Constitution of the United States is a compact to which the people of the several States acceded as separate and sovereign communities, and have a right to judge, each for itself, of any illegal violation of the Constitution, and to choose, each for itself, its own mode and measure of redress."

The same party identified itself with the interests of American slavery, and lifting from it the great weight of odium which the fathers of the Republican had laid upon it became its champion and advocate.

When the party of freedom had awakened the conscience of the nation, and had gained such strength as to show the Democracy that slavery was forever checked in its progress, and its ultimate extinction by legislative authority foredoomed, the Democratic leaders of the South joined in a mad conspiracy to save and perpetuate slavery by destroying the Union, in the name of State sovereignty they declared that secession was a constitutional right, and they resolved to enforce it by arms. They declared that as the Constitution, to which each State in its sovereign capacity *acceded*—there being no common superior to which a matter of difference could be referred—each State might also in its sovereign capacity *secede* from the compact, might dissolve the Union, might annihilate the Republic. The Democracy of eleven slave States undertook the work. So far as it was possible they severed every tie that bound them to the Union. They withdrew all their representatives from every department of the Federal Government; they seized all the Federal property within the limits of their States; they abolished all the Federal courts and every other vestige of Federal authority within their reach; they changed all their State Constitutions, transferring their allegiance to a government of their own creation, styled the Confederate States of America; they assumed sovereign power, and, gathering up every possible element of force, assailed the Union with the most savage and merciless war known to civilized nations. It was not merely, as some maintain, a lawless insurrection of individual traitors. It was "*a civil territorial war*," waged by eight millions of traitors, acting through eleven traitor States, consolidated into a gigantic despotism of treason—a government *de facto*, to which the laws of nations accorded belligerent rights. The Confederacy was acknowledged as a belligerent by all the leading nations of Europe, and at last by every department of the Government of the United States; by the Supreme Court in the celebrated prize cases of 1862, and by repeated acts of both executive and legislative departments.

Never was an issue more clearly made up or more desperately contested. The Confederacy fought for slavery and the rights of secession, for the destruction of the Union, and the establishment of a government based on slavery. The loyal millions fought to destroy the rebellion and its causes. They fought to save slavery by means of disunion; we to establish both liberty and union, and to make them one and inseparable now and forever. It was a life and death struggle between ideas that could no longer dwell together in the same political society. There could be no compromise—there could be no peace while both were left alive. The one must perish if the other triumphed.

There was no compromise. The struggle was continued to the bitter end. In the larger meaning of the word, there was no surrender. The rebels did not lay down their arms, for the soldiers of the Union wrenched them from their grasp. They did not strike their traitor flag; it was shot down by loyal bullets. The rebel army never was disbanded; its regiments and brigades were mustered out by the shot and shell of our victorious armies. They never pulled down the Confederate Government, but its blazing rafters fell in amidst the conflagration of war, and its ashes were scattered by the whirlwind of battle.

And now, fellow-citizens, after the completest victory ever won by human valor—a victory for the Union which was all victory and no concession; after a defeat of the rebels, which was all defeat and no surrender, we are asked to listen to the astounding proposition that this war had no results beyond the mere fact of victory. A great political party is asking the suffrages of the people in support of the unutterably atrocious assertion, that these red handed and vanquished traitors have lost no rights or privileges by their defeat, and the victors have acquired no rights over traitors and treason as the fruits of their victory!—These antediluvian philosophers seem to have turned down a leaf in the record of the life of the Republic in April, 1861, and they propose now, in the year of grace 1866, to begin again where they ceased reading five years ago, as if

there had been no crime, no treason, no delug of blood, no overthrow of rebellion, no triumph of liberty.

And now, fellow-citizens, who are the men that advocate this monstrous doctrine? I cannot answer this question without discussing freely the public conduct of the President of the United States.

For the first eight months after the collapse of the rebellion, I did not hear that any man making the smallest claim to loyalty, presumed to deny the right of the Government to impose conditions upon the States and people lately in rebellion. Certainly the President did not. Both in his practical management and in repeated declarations he affirmed again and again the right of the Government to demand security for the future and to require the performance of certain acts on the part of the rebel States as preliminary to restoration.

You will remember, fellow citizens, that when I addressed you in the Spring of 1865, shortly after the assassination of President Lincoln, I expressed the belief that Andrew Johnson would treat traitors with the severity their crimes demanded. There was a general apprehension that he might be too severe and demand conditions as hard as to make the restoration of rebel States a work of great difficulty. It was said that he knew from personal experience what the rebellion was and what treatment treason deserved.

The American people remembered his repeated declarations on this whole subject. They remembered his bold speech at Nashville on the 9th day of June, 1864, when he accepted the nomination of Vice-President, and used the following language:

"Why all this carnage and devastation if we say that treason might be put down and traitors punished. Therefore I say that traitors should take a back seat in the work of reconstruction. If there be but five thousand men in Tennessee, loyal to the Constitution, loyal to freedom, loyal to justice, these true and faithful men should control the work of reorganization and reformation absolutely. I say that the traitor has ceased to be a citizen and in joining the rebellion has become a public enemy. He forfeited his right to vote with loyal men when he renounced his citizenship and sought to destroy our Government. * * My judgment is he should be subject to a severe ordeal before he is restored to citizenship. * * * Ah, these rebel leaders have a thousand personal reasons for holding out to save their necks from the halter; and these leaders must feel the power of the Government. Treason must be made odious and traitors must be punished. Their great plantations must be seized and divided into small farms and sold to honest, industrious men. The day for protecting the land and the negroes of these authors of the rebellion is past."

They remembered his speeches at Washington after his inauguration, in which the same sentiments were repeated. They remembered that in his address to Gov. Morton and the Indiana delegation, on the 21st of April, 1865—six days after the pistol of Booth made him President of the United States—he said:

"It is not promulgating anything that I have not heretofore said, to say that treason must be made odious, that traitors must be punished and impoverished. They must not only be punished, but their social power must be destroyed. If not, they will still maintain an ascendency, and may again become numerous and powerful; for, in the words of a former Senator of the United States, 'when traitors become numerous enough, treason becomes respectable;' and I say that after making treason odious, every Union man and the Government should be reimbursed out of the pockets of those who have inflicted this great suffering upon the country." * * "Sometimes the rebellion may go on increasing in numbers till the State machinery is overturned, and the country becomes like a man that is paralyzed on one side. But we find in the Constitution a great panacea provided. It provides that the United States (that is the great integer) shall guarantee to each State a republican form of government. Yet if rebellion has been rampant and set aside the machinery of a State for a time, there stands the great law to remove the paralysis and put it on its feet again."

It is true however that there were those who even then expressed doubts of his sincerity, and feared he would betray his trust. When, during the months of May, June and July they saw him appointing Provisional Governors for seven of the rebel States, and ordering the assembling of conventions to form new Constitutions and rebuild their State Governments, many thought he should have called upon Congress to assemble and perform the duty enjoined upon it in the Constitution of guaranteeing to every State in the Union a republican form of government.

The conviction of the people was based upon the cause of his repeated declarations to the Governors and conventions that his work was only provisional and must all be submitted to Congress for its action. On the 29th of May he published his amnesty proclamation, and on the same day appointed W. W. Holden Provisional Governor of North Carolina. In that letter of appointment he declared that whereas "the Constitution of the United States declares that the United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government; * * * and whereas the *rebellion has in its revolutionary progress deprived the people of North Carolina of all civil government*," he therefore appointed Wm. W. Holden Provisional Governor, "with authority to exercise within the limits of said State all the powers necessary and proper to enable the loyal people of North Carolina to restore said State to its constitutional relations, to the Federal Government, and to present such a republican form of State government as will entitle the State to the guaranty of the United States therefor, and its people to the protection of the United States." On the same terms seven other Governors were appointed. On the 12th day of September the Secretary of State, by direction of the President, wrote to Gov. Marion, of Florida, a letter, which embodied in these words:

"*It must, however, be distinctly understood that the restoration to which your proclamation refers will be subject to the decision of Congress.*"

But the confidence of the people did not rest solely upon the fact that the President held that all his work was provisional, and must be referred to Congress for its final settlement. Their confidence was still further strengthened by his repeated official declarations that guaranties must be demanded of the rebel States before they should be restored to their practical relation to the Union.

On the 28th of October the Secretary of State wrote to the Provisional Governor of Georgia as follows:

"The President of the United States *cannot recognize* the people of any State as having resumed the relations of loyalty to the Union that admits as valid any obligations contracted or debts created in their name to promote the war of the rebellion."

On the 1st day of November he wrote to the Provisional Governor of Florida the following:

"Your letter of October 7th was received and submitted to the President. He is gratified with the favorable progress toward reorganization in Florida, and directs me to say that he regards the ratification by the Legislature of the Congressional amendment of the Constitution of the United States as indispensable to a successful restoration of the true legal relations between Florida and the other States, and equally indispensable to the return of peace and harmony throughout the republic."

On the 6th of November he wrote to the Provisional Governor of South Carolina in these words:

"Your dispatch to the President of Nov. 4th has been received. He is not entirely satisfied with the explanation it contains. He deems necessary the passage of adequate ordinances declaring that all insurrectionary proceedings in the State were unlawful and void *ab initio*."

Here he had plainly demanded at least three conditions as indispensable to restoration.

1st. That the rebel States should declare their ordinances of secession void *ab initio*.

2d. That they should ratify the constitutional amendment abolishing slavery.

3d. That they should repudiate the rebel debt and that their whole conduct on these premises should be referred to Congress for its action.

But during the months of autumn there were rumors in the air which troubled the peace of patriotic citizens. It was whispered that the President was going over to our political enemies. It was observed that the tone of the Democratic and rebel press had wonderfully changed toward him.

From the beginning of the war till the summer of 1865, Southern traitors and Northern Democrats had vied with each other in the denunciation of his party enemies—of his political and private character. The rebels had all along denounced him as a renegade, a traitor to his country, a low born boor; while Northern Democratic journals, like the New York World, had denounced him as a turncoat, a tyrant, a boorish tailor, a drunken brute—less respectable than Nero's horse.

But as the fall elections of 1865 approached, they began to speak of him as an old fashioned Democrat, who had not forgotten the lessons of his youth and who would yet turn his back upon the Union party and return to the embrace of his former friends. The people were alarmed at these manifestations, but were somewhat reassured by the declarations of the President made to Maj. Gen. L. Stearns on the 3rd of October, when he said: "The power of those persons who made the attempt at rebellion has been crushed, and now we want to reconstruct the State Governments and have the power to do it. The State institutions are prostrated, laid out on the ground, and they must be taken

up and adapted to the progress of events. * * We must not be too much in a hurry. It is better to let them reconstruct themselves than to force them into it; for if they go wrong the power is in our hands, and we can check them in any stage to the end, and oblige them to correct their errors. * * * * * * * * * In Tennessee I would try to introduce negro suffrage; first, those who have served in the army; those who could read and write, and perhaps a property qualification for others, say $200 or $250."

When Congress met in December last there was great anxiety and no little alarm. From the first hour of the session the little junto of rebel sympathizers, known as the Democratic party in Congress became the eulogists and defenders of the President. Their denunciations of the Union party, re-echoed familiarly as of old through the halls of the Capitol; but their censures were turned to praises, their curses to blessings, when they spoke of the President elected by the Union party.

But even then we did not lose all our faith in Andrew Johnson. His annual message, though carefully worded, reiterated many of his former declarations, and the most radical men in Congress thanked him and took new courage. In that message he said: "It is not too much to ask in the name of the whole people, that on the one side, the plan of restoration shall proceed in conformity with a willingness to cast the disorders of the past into oblivion, and that, on the other, evidence of sincerity in the future maintenance of the Union shall be put beyond any doubt by the ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution, which provides for the abolition of slavery forever within the limits of our country. So long as the adoption of this amendment is delayed so long will doubt, and jealousy, and uncertainty prevail. * * * Indeed it is not too much to ask of the States which are now resuming their place in the family of the Union to give this pledge of perpetual loyalty and peace. Until it is done, the past, however much we may desire it, will not be forgotten." But hardly was the printer's ink dry on the pages of the message when the President began to insist on the immediate admission of representatives from the rebel States. In this demand he was clamorously seconded by the Democratic delegation in Congress, by every Democratic orator and editor in the North and by every rebel of the South. Let it be remembered that the demand was made for months before even Andrew Johnson claimed that the rebellion was legally ended. It was not until the 2d of April, 1866, that he declared by proclamation that the rebellion had ceased in ten of the States; but even then he did not consider it ended in Texas. It was not until the meeting of the Philadelphia Convention, two weeks ago, that he declared the rebellion suppressed in that State.

Who were those representatives for whom admittance into Congress was demanded? Of the eighty-seven elected from rebel States not ten of them ever made professions of loyalty. Fifteen of them had been Generals or Colonels in the rebel army, or members of the rebel Congress or secession conventions.

The President did not long leave us in doubt. In his address to a rebel delegation from Virginia, on the 10th of February, he intimated his purpose of uniting with them, and with them sweep round the circle of the Union, and put down certain Radicals, whose policy he denounced as "a rebellion at the other end of the line."

On the 22d of February he addressed a vast concourse of Northern Democrats, of rebel-in Confederate gray, and of secession sympathizers who had never been out of their holes to bask in the sunshine of Presidential favor since Buchanan betrayed his country, all of whom had assembled to thank him for having refused to give military protection to the freedmen of the South. The utterances in that speech are only too well remembered. I will not repeat them here.

Congress then undertook to extend the protection of the civil Courts over the black loyalists. The President refused his signature, but your loyal Representatives were able to pass it over his head. About the same time, the men of Connecticut were struggling to elect, as their Governor, a gallant soldier who had fought for the Union with distinguished honor from the beginning to the end of the war. He was opposed by the whole strength of that rebel-loving Democracy, headed by Enton Toucey, whose "bad eminence" is a part of the history of the rebellion. A Democratic member of the Thirty-eighth Congress was their candidate for Governor, and Andrew Johnson threw the weight of his great patronage into the scale, recommended his Federal office holders to work for English, and sent a score of his new found friends from Washington to urge the people to defeat the Union General. Thanks to the loyalty of Connecticut, they were able to defeat both President and Democracy and Gen. Hawley was made Governor by a few hundred votes.

The true men of the Cabinet still remained in their places in the faint hope that he might yet come back to the party. But Andrew Johnson was content with no half way measure. He resolved on nothing less than the defeat and overthrow of the Union party. By the aid of a Senator and an Ex-Governor of Wisconsin, who had been repudiated by the loyal men of their State, a call was issued on the 27th of June for a general convention of those who would endorse the President, to meet in Philadelphia on the 16th of August. This call was indorsed by the forty-five Democratic members of Congress, including such patriots as Garrett Davis, of Kentucky; Ross, of Illinois; Rogers, of New Jersey; Finck and Le-Blond, of Ohio. When the Cabinet officers were asked to join in the movement, Dennison, Harlan and Speed responded by denouncing the Convention and sending in their resignations.

The Convention assembled in full force and under rules as rigid and with order and harmony as perfect as ever obtained under the discipline of the Ohio Penitentiary, they have given us the results of their labors in a decalogue of "principles" and an address of four newspaper columns, which must now be regarded as the latest revised of the President's rebel Democratic policy. To understand the policy which the nation is now invited to adopt, it will be necessary to examine somewhat the parties that composed and the purposes which inspired

THE PHILADELPHIA CONVENTION.

Three classes made up the assemblage. First the unwashed, unanointed, unforgiven, unrepentant, unhung rebels of the South. They were represented by such politicians as the rebel Vice President, lately called from the casemates of Fort Warren, by his admiring constituents, to represent them in the Senate of the United States; by such gallant Generals as Dick Taylor, who, when his brigade had captured in battle seven Union men who had escaped the rebel conscription in Louisiana, and had joined a Vermont regiment to fight for the Union, compelled them to dig their own graves, and ordered them shot in his presence; by such clergymen as the Rev. Jesse B. Ferguson, who, years ago, (possibly in anticipation of the wants of his brother Champ, lately hanged in Nashville for twenty Union murders,) proclaimed a *post mortem* gospel, glad tidings for the dead and damned, who gave the weight of his ministerial character to aid in the destruction of the Union, and now speaks touchingly of the "lost cause;" and last, but not least, by Gov. Orr, who taught the blessed lesson that if South Carolina would join the arm-in-arm embrace of Massachusetts, she must first slaughter 25,000 sons of the Bay State. This first class formed the great, dumb, heroic element of the Convention. The second class was the dishonored, depraved defeated remnant of Northern Democracy. The divine Fernando, the sainted martyr Vallandigham, the meek eyed Rynders, and the patriotic H. Clay Dean were there, and their past dislinguished services in the cause of their country were only equaled by the self sacrificing spirit by which they preserved the harmony of the Convention. The part played by the Democracy in the Convention was a humble one. They could not have looked upon their brother delegates from the South without feelings of reverence and admiration for the heroism which led them to battle in the field to sustain a cause for which they (the Northern Democracy) had dared to do no more than speak and vote and pray. Third, last and least, were all those apostate Union men who hunger and thirst after office and the spoils thereof; who greedily gather up the crumbs that fall from the political table. That

class was not the Lazarus of the Convention, for though the Democracy did not hesitate to lick their sores and make them the chief managers, they still lacked the piety of the Jew. They were paupers, disinherited by the party of freedom, and are now begging their political bread from door to door. They were men whose presence in that Convention was a painful surprise to their Union friends; men of whom higher and nobler things were expected; men who had served with honor in the army of the Union. Let us hope that when they see the company into which they have fallen, they will remember the holy cause for which they have fought and retrace their unfortunate steps. It is that convention and those men by whom and through whom the President proposes to settle the great questions now pending before the nation.

And now let us examine its doctrines. The leading thought which inspired all the declarations of the Convention, was uttered by Alexander H. Stephens, late Vice President of the Confederacy, and by Thos. Ewing, Vice President of the Philadelphia Convention. Mr. Stephens said, in this evidence before a committee of Congress, three months ago: "Georgia will accept no conditions of restoration.—She claims to come back with her privilege of representation unimpaired." While the Philadelphia Convention was assembling, Mr. Ewing said: "Even in the heat and violence of the rebellion, the States in which rebel violence most prevailed, were each and all of them, as States, entitled to their representation in the two houses of Congress." This, I say, was the central thought in the Convention, and even the accomplished acrobat of the N. Y. Times, though he waded knee-deep in words, through his four column address, was not able to sink it out of sight. In their "declaration of principles" it is expressly affirmed that the war "left the rights and authority of the States free and unimpaired; that neither congress nor the president has any power to question their right of representation." Planting themselves on this doctrine, they ask that the people elect to the 40th Congress only those who acknowledge the unqualified right of the rebel States to immediate representation. They also ask the President to use his vast official patronage to secure this result.—Freighted with the record of their proceedings, a committee of this mongrel Convention repaired to Washington and in the east room enacted the farce of delivering them.—The President indorsed the doctrines of the Convention and then gave utterance to a sentiment so reckless and revolutionary as to have created the profoundest alarm among loyal men. The Democratic and rebel journals have for months been denouncing Congress as an illegal body, a revolutionary rump, and have demanded their dispersion by force. Alexander H. Stephens expressed the opinion that the acts of this Congress are illegal because the rebel States are not represented.—Garrett Davis expressed the same opinion in the Senate and appealed to the President to disperse them and recognize the rebels and Democratic members in the Congress of the United States. But all these suggestions were regarded as the insane ravings of men blinded by partisan fury. But here, in a speech made by appointment, to a committee whose plans and purposes he not only knew but had helped to form, Andrew Johnson used this language: "We have seen hanging on the verge of the Government as it were, a body called or which assumed to be a Congress of the United States, but in fact a Congress of only part of the States." Who is the "Government" upon the "verge" of which the President declares the Congress of the United States "hangs" as an unlawful appendage? We had supposed that the Government of the United States consisted of the supreme power of the people, vested in the legislative, judicial, and executive departments. He speaks of the Thirty-ninth Congress as "a body called or assumed to be the Congress of the United States." If these words have any meaning, they mean that the President regards your Congress as an unlawful assembly, and if he has the courage to act up to his convictions, he will take the advice of his rebel and Democratic friends and disperse it when it again convenes, as he and his Southern allies dissolved the New Orleans Convention, in blood. It is possible that we are to have a rebellion, not "on the other end of the line," but in the center—in the sacred citadel of the nation. It is possible that he intends to fulfill his promise to make treason "odious," by making himself the most conspicuous example of public treachery. Whatever be the President's meaning, the loyal people will not fail to remind him that he is not the controller of Congress, but the executor of its laws, and the same people who elevated him to his high place, will, if justice and liberty require it, let fall on him a bolt of condemnation which will settle forever the question that Presidents are the servants, not the masters, of the American people.

And now let me examine the doctrine of the Philadelphia Convention, that "the war left the rights and authority of the rebel States unimpaired." I meet this proposition with the undeniable fact that when the Confederacy fell, the authority of the rebel States was not only "impaired" but utterly overthrown. I answer in the words of Andrew Johnson: "the rebellion deprived North Carolina of all civil government"; and that he had appointed a provisional government "to aid in rebuilding a State Government, and restoring North Carolina to her constitutional relations to the Union." I deny the assertion that representation is an inalienable right. I repudiate the atrocious doctrine that rebels in arms were entitled to a voice in the Government which they were fighting at the same time to destroy.—While the rebel army was in winter quarters recruiting for the next campaign, Lee and Johnston, Breckinridge and Bragg, Taylor and Forrest, might have taken their seats, or if not these, then others who had never been brave enough to take such public part in the rebellion that they could not take the test oath, and might have added enough votes to the Democratic strength in the 38th Congress to control the action of that body, and assure the success of the rebellion.

I do not adopt the doctrine that the rebel States were out of the Union, but I hold, in the language of Abraham Lincoln, that "by the rebellion they destroyed their practical relations to the Union." They did not relieve themselves from their obligations to the Union, but by treason and war they forfeited their rights to life and property. It was for the victorious Government to say what mercy should be extended, what rights should be restored.

CONGRESS MUST ORGANIZE REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENTS TO THE STATES.

It is the duty of the Congress of the United States, enjoined by the Constitution, "to guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government."

For the correctness of this position I appeal to the solemn decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the Dorr rebellion in 1842. The court said:

"Under this article of the Constitution it rests with Congress to decide which government of the two set up in Rhode Island is the established one, for as the United States guarantees to each State a republican government, Congress must necessarily determine what government is established in a State before it can decide whether it is republican or not.—When the Senators and Representatives of a State are admitted into the councils of the Union, the authority of the Government under which they are appointed is recognized by the proper constitutional authority, and its decision is binding on every other department of the Government. Undoubtedly a military government established on the permanent government of the State would not be a republican government, and it would be the duty of Congress to overthrow it."

I answer the doctrine of the Philadelphia Convention by the fact that the President demanded three preliminary conditions as indispensable to his recognition of the rebel States to representation in Congress. He demanded:

1st. That these States declare all their acts of secession void from the beginning.

2d. That they should ratify the constitutional amendment abolishing slavery.

3d. That they should repudiate all their debts contracted to support the rebellion.

The Philadelphia Convention says that representation is an inalienable right which the war did not impair. If this be true, the President is condemned for imposing conditions.—But it may be claimed that the three conditions have been complied with, and that State governments have been established in all the eleven States and Congress should have recognized the fact. I answer that with the single exception of Tennessee, not one of the Constitutions of these States have been ratified by the people of these States, or even submitted to them. Can this be called a republican government of a State which was framed by a Convention of pardoned rebels under the dictation of a military Governor and the Commander-in-Chief of the armies of the United States? But even if these governments were lawful and republican in every repect, have the conditions which the President demanded been so secured as to become "irreversible guaranties."

It is said that the Legislatures have repudiated the rebel debt. May they not, a year hence, repeal the acts of repudiation? It is said that the Civil rights bill is now a law, and will give the freedmen adequate protection.—Who does not know that the President who vetoed, and his Democratic allies who voted against the bill, will hasten to repeal it if they ever regain the power in Congress?—We will accept no securities which are based solely on the promises of perjured traitors.—We will accept no mere acts or resolves of rebel convocations or rebel legislatures as the basis of our future peace. The guaranties which the loyal millions of the republic demand as conditions of restoration must be lifted above the reach of traitors and rebel States, and imbedded forever in the imperishable bulwarks of the Constitution. Therefore the loyal representatives in the 39th Congress proposed amendments to the Constitution, which, adopted by three-fourths of the States, will make liberty and union secure for the future. They have proposed, that it shall be a part of the Constitution:

1st. That no State shall deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

2d. That representation shall be based upon the ratio of voters to the whole population.—So that just in proportion as the right of suffrage is extended or restricted in any State, its representative power shall be increased or diminished.

3d. That no person that has ever held a Federal office, or taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and afterward engaged in rebellion against the same, or gave aid and comfort to the enemies thereof, shall hold any office, civil or military, under the United States; but a vote of two-thirds of each House may remove such disability.

4. The public debt of the United States shall never be repudiated, and the rebel debt shall never be paid.

5th. Congress shall have power to enforce these provisions by appropriate legislation.

These propositions appeal to the moral and common sense of the nation as every way worthy to become a part of the fundamental law of a free government. They are conditions with which any State lately in rebellion can comply without humiliation or disgrace, which no State, if sincere in its professions of returning loyalty, would hesitate to adopt.—These conditions were cheerfully adopted by the loyal men of Tennessee, though the President, seconded by the rebels in that State, made every possible effort to prevent it, and Congress immediately declared that State entitled to representation, and the members elect were admitted to their seats. These conditions embraced in the constitutional amendment, and proposed to the late rebel State, form the Congressional policy. Whenever any other of the sinful eleven comply with the same conditions, it can come in as did Tennessee.

THE UNION PARTY VS. THE DEMOCRATIC.

And, now, fellow-citizens, the two policies are before you. It is for you to determine which shall be adopted as the basis of restoration and peace. In the settlement of the great issues you must vote with one of two parties, for there can be no third party. The President has joined the Democratic party, and it has joined with the rebels of the South. The great Union party and its glorious army kept them apart for four years and a half. We fired bullets to the front and ballots to the rear; we conquered them both in the field and at the polls. But, now that our army is withdrawn, the two wings are reunited. They joined at Philadelphia, and Andrew Johnson is their leader. The great Union party now stands face to face with the motley crew. With which will you cast your lot, fellow-citizens? Remember the noble history of the Union party. No party ever had so proud a record.—The Union party saved the Republic against the most powerful and bloody conspiracy ever formed since Satan fell from heaven. It broke the shackles from the limbs of four million slaves, and redeemed the fair fame of the nation. It led its arms to victory on four thousand battle-fields. It won every victory and scattered every army that bore a rebel banner. It has enrolled among its members the old Republican party of freedom; all the loyal Democrats who followed Douglas, or loved their country were their party—all the soldiers who suffered and conquered—the 250,000 heroes who fell on the field of honor were Union men, and could they rise from their bloody graves to-day would vote with the Union party.

The Democratic party is composed of all who conspired to destroy the Republic, and of all those who fought to make treason triumphant. It broke ten thousand oaths, and to its perjury added murder, starvation and assassination. It declared through the State Convention of Ohio in 1861, that if the Union men of Ohio should ever attempt to enter a Southern State to suppress the rebellion by arms they must first pass over the dead bodies of 200,000 Ohio Democrats. In the mid fury of the struggle it declared the war a failure and demanded a cessation of hostilities. In the Democratic party is enrolled every man who led a rebel army or voluntarily carried a rebel musket, every man who resisted the draft, who called the Union soldiers "Lincoln hirelings," negro worshipers," or any vile name. Booth, Wirz, Harold and Payne were Democrats. Every rebel guerilla and jayhawker, every man who ran to Canada to avoid the draft, every bounty jumper, every deserter, every cowardly sneak that ran from danger and disgraced his flag, every man who loves slavery and hates liberty, every man who helped massacre loyal negroes at Fort Pillow, or loyal whites at New Orleans, every Knight of the Golden Circle, every incendiary who helped burn Northern steamboats and Northern hotels, and every villain of whatever name or crime, who loves power more than justice, slavery more than freedom, is a Democrat and an indorser of Andrew Johnson. Fellow citizens, I cannot doubt the issue of such a contest. I have boundless faith in the loyal people, and I beseech them by all the proud achievements of the past five years, by the immortal memories of the heroic dead, by the love they bore to the starved and slaughtered thousands who perished for their country and are sleeping in unknown graves, by all the high and holy considerations of loyalty, justice and truth, to pause not in the work you have begun till the Union, crowned with victory and established by justice, shall enter upon its high career of freedom and peace.

54 W

WERT
BOOKBINDING
Carlisle Pa
Feb 1988